

In particular, the Examiner has not addressed the particular limitations of claim 1 directed to the bonding of the plane light source to the liquid crystal display. As recited in claim 1, there is no air layer interposed between the plane light source device and the liquid crystal display panel.

The Examiner continues to rely on Figs. 1, 2 and 10 of Masuda, and argues that the light pipe 3 with the polarization section 4 is attached to the LCD panel 5 via an adhesive layer (see page 3 of Office Action). However, each of Figs. 1, 2 and 10 in Masuda specifically teach that **an air layer** is disposed between the polarization section 4 and the LCD panel 5.

The Examiner also continues to rely on col. 2, lines 9-13 (which merely describes a polarizing section attached to an LCD but no reference to a light guide); col. 10, lines 50-65 (which describes Figs. 1 and 2 which include the air layer discussed above); col. 11, lines 24-30 and 50-54 (which describe the specific structure of the polarization section 4); col. 15 lines 25-39 (which describes Fig. 10 which includes an air layer); and col. 16, lines 23-28 (which describes the refraction layer in Fig. 10).

Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of these portions to have a light pipe, polarization section and LCD attached to each other without an air layer therebetween the light pipe and LCD.

Still further, it is noted that Masuda teaches away from eliminating an air layer. Specifically, col. 9, lines 3-20 states:

“In the present invention, since it is undesirable that the reflective liquid crystal display device and the front light are in close contact with each other, **the reflective liquid crystal display device is not attached to the front light.** That is, when the reflective type liquid crystal

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/898,060

display device (a liquid crystal cell) and the light guide are closely attached to each other as in the conventional display apparatus, since they are both rigid, bubbles may be introduced therebetween, an adhesive resin may not be sufficiently cured...On the other hand, in the present invention, **an air layer is present between the reflective liquid crystal display device and the front light.**" (emphasis added)

For at least the foregoing reasons, Masuda fails to anticipate claim 1.

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 18, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042

Attorney Docket No.: Q65306